

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/608,702		06/27/2003	Thomas S. Ellis	DP-309231	9673	
22851	7590	11/28/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
DELPHI T	ECHNO	LOGIES, INC.	NGUYEN,	NGUYEN, DILINH P		
M/C 480-41 PO BOX 50				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
TROY, MI	TROY, MI 48007				2814	
				DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•		200
E 1	Application No.	Applicant(s)	W,
Advisory Action	10/608,702	ELLIS ET AL.	rţ
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DiLinh Nguyen	2814	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 November 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The rep	ffidavit, or other evid compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of		a final rejection, whichev	oric later In no
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI).	f the final rejection. IRST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. Satutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension of (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must 	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal.
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	of will not be entered	hecause
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: 	onsideration and/or search (see NC ow); tter form for appeal by materially r corresponding number of finally re	oTE below); educing or simplifying	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	allowable if submitted in a separate	e, timely filed amendr	nent canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ vovided below or appended.	vill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good are and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	avit or other evidence	is necessary
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ails to provide a (1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or atta	cned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered b See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allow	ance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)	. (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant argues that it is incorrect to combine Kaminaga et al. in view of

Shin et al. to reject the independent claim 4.

The arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because Kaminaga et al. disclose an encapsulated, overmolded and/or underfilled electrical component, comprising:

an electrical component encapsulated 1, overmolded and/or underfilled with a polymeric composite including a synthetic resin matrix 7 and inorganic filler particles substantially uniformly distributed in the matrix (fig. 1a, column 6, lines 10-15).

Kaminaga et al. fail to disclose the particles having a platelet structure and the inorganic filler content being 20 percent or less by weight based on the weight of the polymeric composite.

However, Shin et al. disclose a semiconductor device comprising particles having a platelet structure defined by opposite substantially flat and substantially parallel faces (the inorganic fillers such as montmorillonite) (column 3, lines 60), the inorganic filler content being 20 percent or less by weight based on the weight of the polymeric composite (the inorganic filler is 0 to 50 parts by weight based on 100 parts by weight of the polymeric composite) (column 6, lines 57-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the particles of Kaminaga et al. by having inorganic fillers such as montmorillonite, as taught by Shin et al., in order to provide excellent stress cracking resistance and improve heat resistance (column 2, lines 54-56) and improve adhesion for the semiconductor package. Moreover, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add fillers in the composition to control the CTE or to increase a rigidity of the composition.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine the references, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

HOAI PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER